DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 295 JC 900 163

AUTHOR McKee, Jane Gallimore
TITLE Relationship between Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles and Faculty Job Satisfaction.
PUB DATE 16 Feb 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Clearwater Beach, FL, February 14-17, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Evaluation; *College Faculty; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; *Job Satisfaction; *Leadership Styles; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In 1987, a study was conducted to determine faculty perceptions of the leadership styles of community college presidents in West Virginia and Virginia, measure faculty job satisfaction, and explore any correlation between perceived leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction. A random sample of 321 faculty members was selected from 3 West Virginia community colleges and 23 Virginia community colleges. The sample population received a demographic questionnaire and instruments for measuring faculty perception of leadership style and faculty job satisfaction. Study findings, based on a 60% response rate, included the following: (1) 56% of the respondents were male, 54% taught academic subjects, 46% taught vocational subjects, 68% held a master's degree, 38% had over 15 years experience at the same college, and 66% worked on the same campus as the college president; (2) 41% rated their presidents high in terms of Task (i.e., the ability to tell when, where, what, and how to do something) and in terms of Relationship (i.e., providing socio-emotional support and recognition, and facilitating behaviors); (3) 19% viewed their presidents as High Task/Low Relationship, 18% rated their presidents as Low Relationship/Low Task, and 13% perceived their presidents to be High Relationship/Low Task leaders; and (4) high ratings on intrinsic job satisfaction factors (i.e., self-esteem, development opportunities, achievement, and job expectations) and extrinsic job satisfaction factors (i.e., respect and fair treatment, informed in job, amount of supervision, and opportunity for participation) were positively correlated with High Relationship/Low Task and High Task/High Relationship leadership styles. (WBT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316295

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES AND FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION

A Paper Presented

to the

Eastern Educational Research

Association's Annual Conference

Clearwater, Florida

February 16, 1990

by

Jane Gallimore McKee

Marshall University

Huntington, West Virginia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. G. McKee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 900 163

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES AND FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION

Abstract

This study determined the leadership style of community college presidents in West Virginia and Virginia as perceived by faculty members, measured the job satisfaction of the faculty members, and examined the possibility of a correlation between the perceived leadership style of the presidents and the job satisfaction of the community college faculty members. From a population of 2,028 faculty members, a random sample of 321 was selected. Each participant was mailed a cover letter, a demographic survey, the LEAD Other, and the MCMJSS. The total of usable returns was 60%. Job satisfaction was significantly higher for faculty who perceived the leadership style of the president to be S3, High Relationship/Low Task. Ancillary results showed significantly lower job satisfaction among male and vocational faculty members and also among faculty who had spent over15 years at the same institution. This study has implications for university programs as well as professional development programs.

Relationship Between Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles and Faculty Job Satisfaction

Leadership is an endlessly fascinating study. Over the years many people have tried to define leadership, only to discover new innovative ideas that necessitated more examination. Bennis (1985) stated, "Leadership continued to be something everyone knew existed but no one could define" (p. 5).

Peters and Waterman (1982) maintained that characteristics of a leader are the same no matter whether the leader's occupational field is business, education, politics, health occupations, or any other profession. Therefore, research from other fields such as business and industry has helped delineate a better understanding of leadership.

Because higher education is able today to reach greater numbers of citizens than ever before, the president's leadership abilities have undergone study (Benezet, Katz, and Magnusson, 1981; Fisher, 1984; Kauffman, 1980; and Kerr, 1972). Studies have noted the importance of the president's relationship with faculty members (Benezet et al., 1981; Bennis, 1973; Corson, 1975; Elmore, 1977, in Heyns, ed.; Hesburgh, 1977, in Heyns, ed.; and Kauffman, 1980).

An important part of higher education, the community college has attracted the attention and captured the imagination of a large segment of the American people. There are approximately 1250 community colleges in the United States; the number of these institutions doubled and the enrollment quadrupled between 1965 and 1980 (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Much of this attention has centered on the philosophy of the community college: equal access to educational opportunities regardless of race, sex, socio-economic status; accessibility of schools; changing curricula that meet community needs; life-long learning; and shared governance on the part of the faculty (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Because of the interest in leadership and the desire for a better understanding of the duties of

college president, the leadership style of college and university presidents is a subject of interest. Also of interest is the way faculty members view that leadership style.

Leadership Studies

Through the years leadership studies have undergone phases as researchers used a variety of approaches to study the subject. One of those phases was an attempt to define leadership through an historical approach (Schriesheim, Tolliver, and Behling, 1980, in Hersey and Blanchard, eds.). The trait phase emphasized leader characteristics (Glasscock, 1980). The behavior phase emphasized the relationship between leader behavior and subordinate behavior (Guba and Getzels, 1956). Another phase, the situational phase, emphasized that the need for action depended also upon the situation (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969). Burns (1978) identified the Great Man Theory, the Great Events Theory, and the Intellectual Theory.

Business and industry research identified the scientific school of management in which the leader applied scientific and military principles of management (Babbitt, 1913; Fayol, 1916; and Taylor, 1911). The

studies done at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company from 1923 to 1932 established the area of human relations as crucial to an understanding of leadership (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939).

After these findings in the field of human relations, researchers in leadership theory began to utilize the best findings of both the Scientific Management Theory and the Human Relationship Theory and urged research studies to concentrate on both the tasks to be accomplished and the people who were working to accomplish those tasks (Barnard, 1938; Blake and Mouton, 1969; and Stogdill and Coon, 1957).

The Leadership Contingency Model of Fiedler (1967) emphasized the need for varying behaviors by studying three variables: leader-member relationships, task structure, and position power. The favorableness of a situation was defined as "the degree to which the situation enabled the leader to exert influence over the group" (p. 72). Hersey and Blanchard (1969) stated: "The desire to have a single ideal type of leader behavior seems unrealistic" (p. 71). Other studies encouraged a more flexible style that would allow leader variations to improve productivity (House and

Mitchell, 1980, in Hersey and Stinson, eds.; and Schriesheim, Tolliver, and Behling, 1980, in Hersey and Stinson, eds.). Thus, various types of leadership styles were recognized.

Educational Studies

Educational research also recognized that a president/leader must rely on a variety of leadership styles to be truly effective (Benezet et al., 1981; Bennis, 1972; Cohen and March, 1986; Corson, 1975; and Rickman and Farmer, 1974). Research also found that an educational leader was a person who possessed a vision for the institution and was able to communicate that vision to others (Campion, 1987; Corson, 1975; Hesburgh, 1977, in Heyns, ed.; Kauffman, 1980; and Kerr, 1972). The functions of management and control and constituency satisfaction were paramount for the educational leader (Benezet et al., 1982; and Kauffman, 1980).

Job Satisfaction

The area of job satisfaction has intrigued supervisors, administrators, and researchers for years. Questions exist as to its

definition and its place in making a business or a school a more effective and efficient operation.

Likert (1961) found the population he surveyed favored supervisors who thought of employees as human beings rather than persons who were there solely to get work done. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1966) identified job satisfiers: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and the possibility of growth. Job dissatisfiers identified were company policy, administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.

Another key source, Japanese industry, provided researchers with the discovery that workers were the key to increased productivity and that the opportunity for participative management increased both job satisfaction and productivity (Ouichi, 1981). Along these lines in the study of educational employees, Kauffman (1980) found that faculty members indeed wanted control over their work methods and participation in the decision making.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) found leadership related to job satisfaction. Their research indicated a leader who possessed a vision for his or her business organization and who articulated that vision clearly

had employees with significantly higher levels of job satisfaction. Power shared with employees also resulted in higher job satisfaction and performance throughout the organization. The more people believed that they could influence and control the organization, the greater the member satisfaction was.

Leaders of educational institutions must also articulate the institutional purposes in a way that increases the commitment of all employee groups (Austin and Gamson, 1983; Bennis, 1972; Lewis and Becker, 1979; Patterson, Purkey, and Parker, 1986; and Winkler, 1982). Thus, the president of an institution of higher education must be perceived as communicating effectively with the faculty, allowing the members control and participation in school management. The leadership style of the president may be extremely important in establishing these leader behaviors.

With effective schools research showing a shared vision, collaborative relationships, and a democratic decision making as the hallmarks of success, the community college may be a step ahead of all higher education institutions because of its original mission of shared governance (Patterson, Purkey, and Parker, 1986). The leadership style of

the community college president must be one that includes the philosophy of shared governance within the community college. Perceptions of leadership styles of community college presidents may influence faculty job satisfaction.

Methods

Subjects

The participants in this study were community college faculty members employed during the academic year of 1987-88 in the three free-standing community colleges of West Virginia and the 23 community colleges of Virginia. The faculty population that was identified by the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor with no other titles of administrative intent was 2,028. A random sample of 321 was selected from this population.

Instrumentation

The sample population received a packet containing a demographic questionnaire. The packet also contained Hersey and Blanchard's Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Other (LEAD Other) for the measurement of faculty perception of leadership style, and the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scales (MCMJSS) for the measurement of faculty job satisfaction.

The demographic questionnaire included items concerning age, sex, years of teaching experience, level of education, location of work, number of years at institution, and teaching title. These factors, along with those of school size, subject area, and president's tenure, were used as categorical variables in the data analysis.

Hersey and Blanchard (1974) defined leadership as "a process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward accomplishing goals in a given situation" (p. 22). In their studies they identified four basic leader behavior styles based on the equally important variables of task, or telling when, where, what, and how to do something, and relationship, or providing socio-emotional support along with psychological strokes and facilitating behaviors. The four basic

leadership styles were S1-High Task/Low Relationship, S2-High Task/High Relationship, S3-High Relationship/Low Task, and S4-Low Relationship/Low Task.

The LEAD Other (1974) was developed as a means for leaders to receive feedback from subordinates or others regarding perceptions of the leader's style. Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980) established two measures of internal consistency that yielded reliability coefficients of .810 and .613 for LEAD Other.

The instrument for measuring job satisfaction, the MCMJSS, was designed to measure eight facets of perceived intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The response format of the scales was a six point scale with one the lowest possible score for job satisfaction and six the highest possible score for job satisfaction. The intrinsic job satisfaction factors were self-esteem, development opportunities, achievement, and job expectations. The four extrinsic factors were respect and fair treatment, informed in job, amount of supervision, and opportunity for participation. In a study of organizational development in the public schools, Mohrman and associates (1977) established reliability coefficients of .870 and .820.

Data Collection

A cover letter, mailed to participants with the questionnaire and two surveys, explained the study, urged participants to respond, and assured total anonymity to all participants. The initial return response from the 321 participants was 50%. After a second letter, this percentage rose to 66% with a final, usable total of 60%.

Analysis of the Data

Various statistical procedures were applied to the data. Frequency counts were employed to determine perceived leadership style. Means were determined for the overall category of job satisfaction and for the catgories of intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. Job satisfaction scores for each separate item on the survey were also determined by the use of mean scores.

The General Linear Model procedure of the Statistical Analysis System was used to determine the relationship, if any, between leadership styles and job satisfaction. The analysis of variance procedure (ANOVA) at the 0.05 alpha level was used to determine the relationship,

if any, between leadership styles and the items of job satisfaction. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was then administered to find where the significant differences lay.

Findings

The demographic data indicated that of the 192 participants 56% (n = 108) were male and 44% (n = 84) were female. Of these faculty members 54% (n = 104) taught academic subjects and 46% (n = 88) taught vocational subjects. Most of the faculty, or 68% (n = 131), held master's degrees, while 20% (n = 38) held doctor's degrees. The participants with over 15 years experience at the same institution constituted 38% (n = 73) of the participants, while 35% (n = 67) of the participants had been at the same institution for 10 to 15 years.

Most faculty members, 66% (n = 127), worked on the same campus as the president. The participants were divided between large schools, 51% (n = 98), and the school sizes of medium, 28% (n = 54), and small, 21% (n = 40). The largest number of participants, 48% (n = 92), worked at institutions whose presidents had held office from 15 to 20 years.

The highest frequency count for perceived leadership style was for the S2 leadership style. Of the participants 41% (n = 78) perceived their presidents to be S2 leaders. Of the remaining participants 19% (n = 37) perceived their presidents to be S1 leaders, 18% (n = 34) perceived their presidents to be S4 leaders, and 13 % (n = 24) perceived their presidents to be S3 leaders. Multiple styles constituted 10% (n = 19) of the returns and are not discussed. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Leadership Styles as Perceived by Faculty

Leadership Style	Number of Respondents	% Perceived Style
S1-High Task/Low Relationship	37	19%
S2-High Task/High Relationship	78	41%
S3-High Relationship/Low Task	24	13%
S4-Low Relationship/Low Task	34	18%
Other	19	10%

The General Linear Models Procedure indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction (Pr. > .0003). Results of the procedure indicated the means for job satisfaction, both intrinsic and extrinsic, rose toward higher job satisfaction with the S3 and the S2 leadership styles. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

General Linear Models Matrix for Determining Relationship of Job Satisfaction Means and Leadership Styles

	$\bar{X}$ for Job Satisfaction		
Style	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	$\bar{X}$ for Style
S1	4.29	3.49	S1 $\bar{X}$ = 3.89
S2	4.69	4.27	S2 $\bar{X}$ = 4.48
S3	5.03	4.41	S3 $\bar{X}$ = 4.72
S4	4.52	3.22	S4 $\bar{X}$ = 3.87
	$\bar{X}$ INTRINSIC	$\bar{X}$ EXTRINSIC	JS $\bar{X}$
	$\bar{X}$ = 4.61	$\bar{X}$ = 3.92	$\bar{X}$ = 4.24

Anova scores indicated a statistically significant difference between leadership styles and the categories of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. ANOVA also indicated a significant difference between leadership styles and each individual item under intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

ANOVA Scores for Instrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction Factor	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr. > F
Intrinsic	3	10.0271	3.3423	4.02	.0084
Extrinsic	3	42.0417	14.0139	13.41	.0001
INTRINSIC					
1. Self-esteem/ Self-respect	3	7.4404	2.4801	2.89	.0366
2. Personal growth/ development	3	20.8068	6.9355	4.59	.0040
3. Accomplishment	3	9.6806	3.2268	3.04	.0303
4. Job Expectations	3	11.3245	3.7748	2.72	.0456
EXTRINSIC					
5. Respect/fair treatment from superiors	3	42.3813	14.1271	8.43	.0001
6. Informed in job	3	41.7328	13.9109	9.68	.0001
7. Amount of supervision	3	36.2926	12.0975	6.21	.0005
8. Participation in/ methods, procedures, goals	3	54.7125	18.2375	9.32	.0001

Duncan's Multiple Range Test found statistically significant difference among the leadership styles. The highest mean scores for all items under job satisfaction occurred with the S3, High Relationship/Low Task, leadership style (see Table 4). This leadership style was one in which little time was spent in telling subordinates what to do and how to do it. Concentration was on building a relationship of support and concern for individuals, removal of obstacles, and recognition of subordinate contributions.

Table 4
Duncan's Multiple Range Test Scores for Job Satisfaction Items by Leadership Styles

Job Satisfaction Items	Leadership Styles			
	S1	S2	S3	S4
1. Self-esteem	4.53	4.88	5.12*	5.00*
2. Growth and development	3.89	4.22	5.00*	4.09
3. Accomplishment	4.51	5.01*	5.08*	4.71
4. Job Expectations	4.23	4.66	4.92*	4.29
5. Respect and fair treatment	3.89	4.76*	4.88*	3.77
6. Informed in job	3.60	4.41*	4.48*	3.35
7. Amount of supervision	3.17*	3.62*	3.76*	2.50
8. Participation	3.32	4.33*	4.52*	3.27
9. Intrinsic satisfaction	4.29	4.70	5.03*	4.52
10. Extrinsic satisfaction	3.50	4.28*	4.41*	3.22

*Statistically different means

Ancillary data findings were of interest. ANOVA indicated a significant difference between job satisfaction and the categoric variables of department, years at institution, and sex. Job satisfaction scores were significantly higher for the academic department in the areas of self-esteem, accomplishment, job expectations, respect and fair treatment, and informed in job.

Job satisfaction scores were significantly lower in informed in job and participation for faculty members who had been employed at the same institution for over 15 years, the group of participants that contained the largest number of faculty. The job satisfaction scores were significantly lower for men in the category of extrinsic job satisfaction and in the individual item of participation. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Means for Job Satisfaction by Department, Years at Institution, and Sex

Job Satisfaction Variable	Mean	Department	Mean	Department
Self-esteem	5.04*	Academic	4.63	Vocational
Accomplishment	4.98*	Academic	4.68	Vocational
Expectations	4.69*	Academic	4.33	Vocational
Respect and fair treatment	4.60*	Academic	4.14	Vocational
Informed in job	4.23*	Academic	3.80	Vocational
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.07*	Academic	3.74	Vocational

Job Satisfaction Variable	Mean	Years at Institution
Informed in job	4.30	10-15
	4.26	fewer than 5
	4.24	5-9
	3.63*	over 15
Participation	4.65	fewer than 5
	4.15	10-15
	4.07	5-9
	3.41*	over 15
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.29	fewer than 5
	4.15	10-15
	4.09	5-9
	3.52*	over 15

Job Satisfaction Variable	Mean	Sex	Mean	Sex
Participation	4.29*	Female	3.76	Male
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.12*	Female	3.76	Male

*Statistically different means

Conclusions

The leadership style of community college presidents as perceived by faculty made a difference in the level of job satisfaction, both intrinsic and extrinsic, among those community college faculty members in West Virginia and Virginia. Thus, if a community college president in these states wished to increase the job satisfaction of the institution's faculty, he or she would employ the S3, High Relationship/Low Task, leadership style. This style would provide socio-emotional support for the followers and allow them the opportunity to engage in two-way communications and in participation in the determination of aims, procedures, and goals of the institution.

High relationship behavior in West Virginia and Virginia contributed to the job satisfaction of the faculty in the areas of self-esteem, development opportunities, accomplishment, job expectations, respect and fair treatment, amount of supervision, informed in job, and participation. Use of a style that removed obstacles, gave participatory opportunity in making institutional decisions, and built mutual trust increased job satisfaction.

In order to increase the job satisfaction of vocational faculty in West Virginia and Virginia, a community college president would emphasize relationship behavior that would recognize the value and importance of the vocational contributions. The president would also emphasize behaviors that would promote respect and fair treatment from superiors and provide opportunity for communication.

If the community college president wished to increase the job satisfaction of faculty members who have been at West Virginia and Virginia community colleges for over 15 years, that president would engage in relationship behaviors that would lead to greater communications and greater participation for this group. The leader would find ways to recognize the valuable experiences of these people.

If the community college president wished to increase the job satisfaction of the male faculty members at community colleges in West Virginia and Virginia, the president would engage in relationship behavior

that would provide greater opportunity for participation in institutional decisions and more opportunity for two-way communications. The S3 leader would provide support and opportunity that allowed the followers to do the job.

Educational Significance

This study made it clear that the president's leadership style as perceived by faculty made a difference in the job satisfaction of faculty members in community colleges in West Virginia and Virginia. Research dealing with human relations has indicated a need to focus on feelings and emotions of people involved. The findings of this study corroborated that need among community college faculty in West Virginia and Virginia.

The leadership style that made a difference in job satisfaction was the S3, High Relationship/Low Task, style. This leader did not find it necessary to outline a rigid plan of tasks to be accomplished, nor did the leader tell the followers what to do. Instead this leader supplied support, made the way to accomplishment easier, and recognized those accomplishments. This leader acted as a facilitator, delegating responsibilities and opening channels of communication.

The S3 leadership style might be helpful in reinforcing an important mission of the community college in West Virginia and Virginia, that of shared governance. This study supported research that showed participation, or shared governance, a key to job satisfaction (Mohrman et al., 1977; and Gray, 1985). Winkler (1982), who found autonomy a morale booster among community college faculty, is also supported in these findings.

Universities and agencies who train community college presidents and who provide staff development for those administrators should make their people aware of the need to focus on a leadership style that allows participation and involvement on the part of the faculty. These administrators need to be made aware of the importance of support and recognition to the faculty from the president. Training in interpersonal relationship skills would be appropriate.

Search committees and others responsible for the selection of community college presidents should include the area of relationship behavior in the selection criteria. Efforts should be made to assess the relationship behaviors of future presidents.

Austin and Gamson (1983) indicated that task and decision making could be more collaborative, thereby increasing faculty job satisfaction. Community college presidents in West Virginia and Virginia should provide relationship behavior that facilitates participatory decisions concerning institutional methods, aims, and goals. By allowing faculty input and participation, faculty job satisfaction would increase.

A group with significantly lower job satisfaction was the group composed of faculty members who had been at their respective institutions for over 15 years. This finding might support the Hersey Blanchard maturity readiness concept that suggested a change of leadership style as the followers' maturity grew. Since most faculty perceived presidents' leadership style as S2, perhaps a change is called for due to growth in maturity. Community colleges need to create avenues for experienced faculty members to continue professional growth and to contribute their expertise to the operating of their schools.

Those participants with lengthy tenure at community colleges in West Virginia and Virginia did not perceive their leaders as supplying needed relationship behaviors. Neither did the vocational faculty members. Presidents need to find ways to involve the vocational faculty

so that their important and unique contributions to the schools will be underscored. The contributions from these members of the faculty should be recognized and highlighted. Similarly, male faculty members did not perceive the leader as providing support and opportunity. These faculty need to be helped to become stakeholders in their institutions in order to increase job satisfaction.

The empowerment of followers may bring more effective leadership (Peters and Waterman, 1982; and National Association of Secondary School Principals Assessment Center, 1986). Since the college or university president does affect the substance and style of the institution, community college presidents in West Virginia and Virginia should employ S3 leadership style if they wish to bring about higher job satisfaction among their faculty members.

References

Austin, A. & Gamson, Z.F. (1983). Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. Ashe-Eric Higher Education Research Report Number 10.

Barnard, C.I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Benezet, L.T., Katz, J., and Magnusson, F.W. (1981). Style and substance: Leadership and the college presidency. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Bennis, W. (1973). The leaning ivory tower. Washington, D.C.: Jossey Bass.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985) Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. Philadelphia: Harper & Row.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1969). Building a dynamic corporation through grid organizational development. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Bobbitt, F. (1913). The supervision of city schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Campion, N.R. (1987). Dartmouth feels it has a winner. Boston Globe, p. A7.

Cohen, A. & Brawer, F. (1982). The american community college. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. & March, J.G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The amarican college president. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Corson, J.J. (1975). The governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw Hill.

Elmore, J.E. (1977). Developing faculty leadership. In R. Heyns (Ed.), Leadership for Higher Education (pp. 32-37). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Fayol, H. (1949). General and industrial management. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fisher, J.L. (1984). Power of the presidency. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Glasscock, R.L. (1980). Leadership styles of chief executive officers in texas public community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1980). University Microfilms International, 8102452.

Gray, N.S. (1985). Participation in decision making and its effect on job satisfaction and role stress of staff in child development agencies in the United States (Doctoral dissertation,West Virginia University).1985.

Guba, E.F. & Getzels, J.W. (1956). Interests and value patterns of air force officers. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 16, 465-470.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1969). Management of organizational behavior: utilizing human resources. New York: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1974). So you want to know your leadership style. Training and Development Journal, nv, 22-27.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1966). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Hesburgh, T.M. (1977). The presidency: A personalist manifesto. In R. Heyns (Ed.), Leadership for Higher Education (pp. 1-13). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

House, R.J. & Mitchell, T.R. (1980) Path goal theory of leadership. In P. Hersey and J. Stinson (Eds.), Perspectives in Leadership Effectiveness (pp. 83-119). Ohio University: Center for Leadership Studies.

Kauffman, J.F. (1980). At the pleasure of the board. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Kerr, C. (1972). The uses of the university. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. (1988). The leadership challenge. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lewis, D.R. & Becker, W.E. (1979). Academic rewards in higher education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Bollinger Publishing Company.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A., Mohrman, S.A., Duncan, R.B., & Zaltman, G. (1977). An assessment of a structural task approach to organizational development in a school system. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Ouichi, W.G. (1981). Theory z. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Patterson, J., Purkey, S.C., & Parker, J.V. (1986). Productive school systems for a nonrational world. Alexandria, Virginia: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R.H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Random House.

Rickman, B.M. & Farmer, R.N. (1974). Leadership goals and power in higher education. Washington, D.C.: Jossey Bass.

Roethlisberger, F.J. & Dickson, W.J. (1939). Management and the worker. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Schriesheim, C.A., Tolliver, J.M., & Behling, O.C. (1980). Leadership: Some organizational and managerial implications. In P. Hersey and J. Stinson (Eds.), Perspectives in Leadership Effectiveness (pp. 3-12). Ohio University: Center for Leadership Studies.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (Eds.) (1957). Leader behavior: its description and measurement (Monograph No. 88). Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University.

Taylor, F. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.

Walter, J.E., Caldwell, S.D., & Marshall, J. (1980). Validity of situational leadership. Educational Leadership, 37, 618-621.

Winkler, L.D. (1982). Job satisfaction of university faculty in the united states (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1982). University Microfilms International, 8217565.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES APR 5 1990